

1 LAWRENCE A. ORGAN (SBN 175503)
larry@civilrightsca.com
2 MARQUI HOOD (SBN 214718)
marqui@civilrightsca.com
3 CIMONE A. NUNLEY (SBN 326915)
cimone@civilrightsca.com
4 **CALIFORNIA CIVIL RIGHTS LAW GROUP**
332 San Anselmo Avenue
San Anselmo, California 94960
Telephone: (415)-453-7352
Facsimile: (415)-785-7352

8 J. BERNARD ALEXANDER (SBN 128307)
balexander@amfllp.com
9 **ALEXANDER MORRISON & FEHR LLP**
1900 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 900
Los Angeles, California 90067
11 Telephone: (310) 394-0888
Facsimile: (310) 394-0811

1 MICHAEL RUBIN (SBN 80618)
mrubin@altber.com
2 JONATHAN ROSENTHAL (SBN 329638)
jrosenthal@altber.com
3 **ALTSHULER BERZON LLP**
177 Post Street, Suite 300
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 421-7151
Facsimile: (415) 362-8064

7 DUSTIN L. COLLIER (SBN 264766)
dcollier@collierlawsf.com
8 V. JOSHUA SOCKS (SBN 303443)
jsocks@collierlawsf.com
9 ELIZABETH R. MALAY (SBN 336745)
emalay@collierlawsf.com
10 DREW F. TETI (SBN 267641)
drew@collierlawsf.com
11 **COLLIER LAW FIRM, LLP**
240 Tamal Vista Blvd. Suite 100
Corte Madera, CA 94925
Telephone: (415) 767-0047
Facsimile: (415) 767-0037

15 Attorneys for Plaintiff,
OWEN DIAZ

16 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

17 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

20 OWEN DIAZ,

21 Plaintiff,

22 v.

23 TESLA, INC. dba TESLA MOTORS, INC.,

24 Defendant.

Case No. 3:17-cv-06748-WHO

25 **PLAINTIFF'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF
MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES AND
EXPENSES**

26 Hearing Date: January 3, 2024
Time: 2:00 PM

27 Trial Date: September 27, 2020
Complaint filed: October 16, 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	ARGUMENT	2
A.	Plaintiff Diaz was Highly Successful.	2
B.	The Requested Hours Were Reasonable.....	4
1.	The hours expended after the first trial were reasonable.	4
2.	Counsels' efforts were neither duplicative nor inefficient.	7
3.	Mr. Diaz's use of a range of "focus groups" was reasonable.	8
4.	Counsel consolidated and underbilled most tasks that took 0.1 hours or less.	9
5.	Counsel's fees for "travel" are reasonable.	10
6.	Mr. Organ's attendance at the earlier Elon Musk trial was reasonable.....	10
7.	There was an inadvertent clerical error in Mr. Diaz's original motion.....	10
C.	The Court Should Award a Multiplier	11
D.	Mr. Diaz's Claimed Expenses Are Reasonable and Fully Supported.	13
E.	Counsel's Fees-on-Fees Hours Are Reasonable.....	14
III.	CONCLUSION.....	15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**Page(s)****Federal Cases**

	Page(s)
<i>Associated Diesel Serv. & Equip. Co. v. Terex Corp.</i> , 46 F.3d 1138 (9th Cir. 1995)	3
<i>Baker v. Barnard Constr. Co.</i> , 1999 WL 35809483 (D.N.M. June 8, 1999)	6
<i>Bell v. Williams</i> , 2023 WL 4850761 (N.D. Cal. Jul. 28, 2023).....	12
<i>Blackwell v. Foley</i> , 724 F. Supp. 2d 1068 (N.D. Cal. Jul. 15, 2010)	4
<i>Chaid v. Glickman</i> , 1999 WL 33292940 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 17, 1999)	8
<i>Chalmers v. City of Los Angeles</i> , 676 F. Supp. 1515 (C.D. Cal. 1987)	12
<i>City of Riverside v. Rivera</i> , 477 U.S. 561 (1986).....	2, 3
<i>Copeland v. Marshall</i> , 641 F.2d 880 (D.C. Cir. 1980) (<i>en banc</i>).....	2
<i>Diaz v. Tesla</i> , 9th Cir. No. 23-3642, Dkt. 5.1	3
<i>Domino's Pizza, Inc. v. McDonald</i> , 546 U.S. 470 (2006).....	11
<i>Edmo v. Idaho Dept. of Correction</i> , 2022 WL 16860011 (D. ID. Sept. 30, 2022)	7, 11
<i>Evon v. Law Offices of Sidney Mickell</i> , 688 F.3d 1015 (9th Cir. 2012)	4
<i>Faush v. Tuesday Morning, Inc.</i> , 808 F.3d 208 (3d Cir. 2015).....	11
<i>Fegley v. Higgins</i> , 19 F.3d 1126 (6th Cir. 1994)	4

1	<i>Gries v. Zimmer, Inc.</i> , 795 F. Supp. 1379 (W.D.N.C. 1992)	6
2	<i>Hensley v. Eckerhart</i> , 461 U.S. 424 (1983).....	4
4	<i>Hernandez v. Grullense</i> , 2014 WL 1724356 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 30, 2014)	6
6	<i>Herrington v. Cnty. of Sonoma</i> , 883 F.2d 739 (9th Cir. 1989)	12
8	<i>Indep. Living Aids, Inc. v. Maxi-Aids, Inc.</i> , 25 F. Supp. 2d 127 (E.D.N.Y. 1998)	6
9	<i>Krekelberg v. City of Minneapolis</i> , 2023 WL 4828382 (D. Minn. July 27, 2023)	6
11	<i>Masimo Corp. v. Tyco Health Care Grp., L.P.</i> , 2007 WL 5279897 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 5, 2007).....	9
13	<i>Medina v. City of Menlo Park</i> , 2009 WL 10710479 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 2, 2009).....	15
15	<i>Moreno v. City of Sacramento</i> , 534 F.3d 1106 (9th Cir. 2008)	6, 7
16	<i>Public.Resource.org v. Internal Revenue Serv.</i> , 2015 WL 9987018 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 20, 2015)	15
18	<i>Quesada v. Thomason</i> , 850 F.2d 537 (9th Cir. 1988)	2, 6
20	<i>Seebach v. BMW of N. Am., LLC</i> , 2020 WL 4923664 (E.D. Cal. Aug. 21, 2020).....	15
22	<i>Stonebrae, L.P. v. Toll Bros.</i> , 2011 WL 1334444 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 7, 2011).....	6
23	<i>Strategic Partners, Inc. v. FIGS, Inc.</i> , 2021 WL 8917973 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 29, 2021).....	15
25	<i>In re Tesla Inc., Sec. Litig.</i> , 2023 WL 4032010 (N.D. Cal. June 14, 2023)	10
27	<i>In re TFT-LCD (Flat Panel) Antitrust Litig.</i> , 2013 WL 1365900 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 3, 2013)	10
28		

1	<i>Vargas v. Howell,</i> 949 F.3d 1188 (9th Cir. 2020)	3
2		
3	<i>West v. Aetna Life Ins. Co.,</i> 188 F. Supp. 2d 1096 (N.D. Iowa 2002).....	6
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 Plaintiff Owen Diaz and his counsel achieved great success in this litigation and are
 3 entitled to have Tesla fully compensate them for their reasonable attorneys' fees and expenses.
 4 Throughout more than six years of litigation, Mr. Diaz's attorneys acted in accordance with the
 5 highest standards of the civil rights bar, thereby vindicating Mr. Diaz's right to be free from
 6 "endemic racism at the Tesla factory and Tesla's repeated failure to rectify it." ECF 491 at 1. As
 7 the Court recognized, Plaintiff's counsel presented "[a] shocking amount of evidence at trial [that
 8 Mr. Diaz] was regularly subjected to being called the N-word and other racial slurs," and
 9 established that he had "endured awful, pervasive racism in his workplace." *Id.* at 23. Counsels'
 10 efforts resulted in a jury verdict of \$3,175,000, which the Court rightly characterized as a
 11 "substantial award" for a civil rights plaintiff. *Id.* at 27:24-28:2. Counsels' professionalism and
 12 dedication to furthering the cause of justice is precisely the type of conduct that the Civil Rights
 13 Attorneys' Fees Awards Act was designed to promote.

14 Section 1988 was enacted to encourage highly qualified private attorneys to represent
 15 civil rights plaintiffs like Mr. Diaz, whom Congress recognized often cannot afford to retain
 16 counsel as skilled and experienced as those who regularly handle complex civil litigation for
 17 well-funded corporate clients. The Act thus mandates that when civil rights plaintiffs prevail,
 18 their attorneys—who, like Plaintiff's attorneys here, must often spend years in litigation without
 19 being paid a penny for their efforts, while advancing tens of thousands of dollars in expenses on
 20 their client's behalf—will be compensated at the same current hourly rates that their corporate
 21 firm counterparts charge for all time reasonably expended in the litigation. Under the governing
 22 statutory standards, Mr. Diaz is entitled to a fully compensatory fee for his counsels' exemplary
 23 efforts in obtaining his \$3.175 million judgment against Tesla.

24 Tesla asks this Court to slash counsels' hours by arbitrary percentages for a variety of
 25 unsubstantiated reasons (which, if all were applied, would result in double- and triple-counted
 26 reductions). Yet it provides no meaningful support for these requests; fails to identify *any*
 27 specific duplicative time records; and offers only a few isolated instances of purported
 28 inefficiencies—each of which turns out to be reasonable litigation activity, especially from the

1 perspective of what was known at the time the litigation decisions were made. Tesla also ignores
 2 the extent to which its tenacious, aggressive defense tactics caused much of the work it now
 3 challenges as excessive, despite the well-accepted principle that a defendant “cannot litigate
 4 tenaciously and then be heard to complain about the time necessarily spent by the plaintiff in
 5 response.” *Copeland v. Marshall*, 641 F.2d 880, 904 (D.C. Cir. 1980) (*en banc*).

6 **II. ARGUMENT**

7 Plaintiff’s lodestar is “presumed to be the reasonable fee contemplated by §1988.” *City of*
Riverside v. Rivera, 477 U.S. 561, 568 (1986). Once plaintiff has submitted evidence sufficient
 9 to support that fee, the burden shifts to defendant to overcome the presumption.

10 Tesla makes no attempt to challenge Mr. Diaz’s counsel’s hourly rates, ECF 500 5:14-
 11 6:10—likely because they are well below Tesla’s firms’ own rates. ECF 494-7 20:20-21:7, Ex.
 12 L.¹ Nor does Tesla challenge the manner in which counsel maintained and presented their time
 13 records (contemporaneously, electronically, down to a tenth of an hour, with a detailed
 14 description of each task performed), or dispute that they in fact performed the tasks documented
 15 in those records. Tesla also ignores that counsel *already* exercised substantial billing judgment,
 16 eliminating more than 10% of the time actually expended from the requested fee (in addition to
 17 12 months of time entries in 2017-18 that were lost due to a timekeeping software error). ECF
 18 500 17:23-18:16; *see infra* at 6:6-10. Tesla thus fails to establish that the presumptive lodestar
 19 should be further reduced—let alone slashed in half—based on unsubstantiated arguments that
 20 counsels’ hours were excessive or otherwise unreasonable.

21 **A. Plaintiff Diaz was Highly Successful.**

22 Tesla’s request for a 25% across-the-board fee reduction due to Mr. Diaz’s supposedly
 23 “extremely limited” success (essentially, a negative multiplier) is preposterous. ECF 500 14:10-
 24 13. As the Court recognized, Mr. Diaz achieved substantial success in this case. After all, he
 25 prevailed in his civil rights claims against one of the largest companies in the world, which was

27 **¹** Tesla also argues that fees should be reduced because Mr. Diaz had a contingency fee
 28 agreement with counsel, yet it offers no evidence or case law to support this proposition, which
 is contrary to Ninth Circuit law. *Quesada v. Thomason*, 850 F.2d 537, 544 (9th Cir. 1988).

1 represented during the past several years by one of the most aggressive litigation firms in the
 2 country, and he won a judgment of more than \$3 million after two trials and two rounds of post-
 3 trial briefing. ECF 491 24:15-18. Moreover, the first verdict—\$136.9 million—made history and
 4 sent a powerful message to Tesla and other employers (and workers throughout the country) that
 5 racial harassment and the unchecked use of the N-word in the workplace will not be
 6 countenanced. Throughout it all, Tesla asserted that it should not be held liable *at all* and that
 7 any punitive damages should be sharply reduced or entirely eliminated—arguments the Court
 8 repeatedly rejected. Mr. Diaz’s success in this case is undeniable and his attorneys’ efforts
 9 unquestionably furthered the goals of the federal civil rights laws.

10 It is irrelevant that the Court’s judgment would have been higher had Mr. Diaz accepted
 11 the \$15 million remittitur. ECF 500 15:12-16. The success of a civil rights plaintiff’s litigation
 12 decisions cannot be judged in hindsight, because that is not how such decisions are made.
 13 Instead, the relevant question is whether particular work would reasonably have been performed
 14 by attorneys representing a regular fee-paying client. *See, e.g., City of Riverside*, 477 U.S. at 575.
 15 Tesla also makes no effort to respond to Mr. Diaz’s point that had he accepted the remitted
 16 amount, he would have waived all appellate rights, while Tesla could have appealed liability and
 17 the fact *and* amount of compensatory and punitive damages, leaving Diaz with no guarantee of
 18 retaining any of the remitted amounts. *Associated Diesel Serv. & Equip. Co. v. Terex Corp.*, 46
 19 F.3d 1138 (9th Cir. 1995).² Tesla’s contention that *Mr. Diaz* thereby “unreasonably protracted”
 20 the litigation, ECF 500 15:7-12, is therefore mistaken, especially because it was *Tesla* that
 21 sought to overturn the first jury verdict, ECF 317, while continuing to argue for a new liability
 22 trial even after Plaintiff opted for a new trial on damages, ECF 359.

23 Tesla next urges the Court to reduce the lodestar because it is higher than the second
 24 damages award. But especially in civil rights litigation “[i]t is not per se unreasonable for
 25 attorneys to receive a fee award that exceeds the amount recovered by their clients.” *Vargas v.*
 26

27 ² Tesla has now dropped its challenge to the first jury’s liability finding, limiting its cross-
 28 appeal to the amount of punitive damages only. *See Diaz v. Tesla*, 9th Cir. No. 23-3642, Dkt. 5.1
 (Mediation Questionnaire) at 2.

1 *Howell*, 949 F.3d 1188, 1196–97 (9th Cir. 2020). Indeed, the Supreme Court “has expressly
 2 rejected the proposition that fee awards must be in proportion to the amount of damages
 3 recovered” in civil rights actions. *Evon v. Law Offices of Sidney Mickell*, 688 F.3d 1015, 1033
 4 (9th Cir. 2012). In such actions, “[c]ourts should not place an undue emphasis on the amount of
 5 the plaintiff’s recovery because an award of attorney fees … encourages the vindication of
 6 congressionally identified policies and rights.” *Fegley v. Higgins*, 19 F.3d 1126, 1134–35 (6th
 7 Cir. 1994). Capping fees at the amount of a damages award is “especially inappropriate where
 8 the amount of fees was driven up by defendants’ resistance to the lawsuit,” *Blackwell v. Foley*,
 9 724 F. Supp. 2d 1068, 1077 (N.D. Cal. Jul. 15, 2010), as here. Moreover, tethering counsels’ fees
 10 to the damages award rather than the amount and quality of work actually performed would
 11 disincentivize attorneys from representing blue collar civil rights plaintiffs against well-funded
 12 and aggressive defendants—contrary to the congressional purpose of Section 1988.

13 In the limited-success cases cited by Tesla, fees were reduced because counsel spent
 14 considerable time on unrelated claims, or on claims against unrelated defendants, that plaintiffs
 15 lost on the merits. That is not this case, and Mr. Diaz already eliminated from his fees request the
 16 time spent on dismissed claims or parties, while explaining why a fully compensatory fee should
 17 be paid on all remaining time because it was “related” work under *Hensley v. Eckerhart*, 461
 18 U.S. 424, 436 (1983)—a point Tesla ignores. *See* ECF 494 14:16–15:20.

19 **B. The Requested Hours Were Reasonable.**

20 Tesla does not dispute Mr. Diaz’s recounting of the six-year history of this case; the
 21 uniquely complex legal and factual issues involved; or his showing that Tesla’s obstructive
 22 litigation tactics (including withholding highly relevant discovery and repeatedly seeking to
 23 relitigate issues it had lost) required considerable additional time to address. Tesla’s remaining
 24 arguments are unsupported by the record and rife with analytical flaws.

25 **1. The hours expended after the first trial were reasonable.**

26 Tesla asks the Court to cap fees for the “second trial” at 75% of the fees requested for the
 27 “first trial”—an artificial reduction that does not rest on a single specific instance of an
 28 unreasonable fee entry pertaining to the second trial or either set of post-trial efforts.

1 First, Tesla’s seemingly precise time comparisons are highly misleading, because they
 2 attribute to the “second trial” all of the time Mr. Diaz’s counsel spent responding to multiple
 3 rounds of post-trial briefing, almost entirely related to *Tesla*’s own motions pertaining to the *first*
 4 trial. *See Mot.* at 9. As the Court is aware, a considerable portion of the time spent between the
 5 “first” and “second” trials was spent preserving the first jury’s finding that Tesla was liable for
 6 compensatory and punitive damages. Tesla’s time comparisons are particularly misleading,
 7 moreover, because they fail to consider nearly an entire year of litigation efforts by CCRLG,
 8 whose time records between late March 2017 and February 2018 were lost in transitioning to a
 9 new timekeeping system (and thus excluded from Mr. Diaz’s lodestar request). Supp. Decl. of
 10 Larry Organ ¶ 15 (estimating the lodestar value of that lost time of approximately \$65,000).

11 Mr. Diaz’s counsel acted reasonably in defending against Tesla’s persistent efforts to
 12 undo the first jury’s compensatory and liability findings. That it took substantial time to respond
 13 effectively to post-trial arguments presented by Tesla’s new attorneys (and recall, Mr. Diaz
 14 *prevailed* on all those arguments) surely does not make that time unreasonable. Tesla simply
 15 refused to accept no for an answer as to a whole range of issues, thus forcing Mr. Diaz’s counsel
 16 (and the Court) to re-visit issues that seemed to have been resolved, based on arguments resting
 17 on new cases, slightly different contexts, or different witnesses or exhibits.³ Mr. Diaz’s counsel
 18 also needed to pivot, in preparing for the second trial, to respond to new defense theories and
 19 strategies emerging from Tesla’s new attorneys, and to formulate a trial plan that would
 20 compensate for the fact that some of the liability-related evidence and arguments that may have
 21 affected the punitive damages award in the first trial would not be relevant or otherwise available
 22 for the time-limited damages retrial. *See, e.g.* ECF 398 2:20-3:25 (Tesla’s strategic shift from
 23 denying liability because Diaz was not a Tesla employee to disputing that instances of

24
 25 ³ *See, e.g.*, ECF 398 4:1-5:4 (pretrial assertion that parties needed to retry punitive damages
 26 liability); ECF 381 1:2-12:8, 8:25-11:9; ECF 398 37:1-3 (efforts to introduce new witnesses and
 27 evidence despite Court’s contrary ruling); ECF 381 7:9-8:24, 11:10-17:22 (motion to exclude
 28 certain first-trial witnesses); ECF 389 3:1-26:28, 31:1-33:28, 37:5-7, 46:25-49:10 (challenge to
 jury instructions used during first trial and proposed nominal damages and punitive damages
 instructions); ECF 381 1:2-12:8, 8:25-11:9 (insistence on being allowed to present new evidence
 and witnesses); ECF 478 (trial misconduct, which required additional briefing).

1 harassment ever occurred). Essentially, Tesla's request for a reduction seeks "to protect
 2 defendant[] from the consequences of [its] litigation decisions." *Hernandez v. Grullense*, No. 12-
 3 CV-03257-WHO, 2014 WL 1724356, at *16 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 30, 2014).⁴

4 Tesla had the opportunity to demonstrate (if true) that Mr. Diaz's attorneys billed more
 5 than Tesla's, either in the aggregate or as to particular issues, ECF 494 11n.4, yet Tesla failed to
 6 provide that information to Plaintiff or to present it to the Court. *See Elec. Constr. Indus.*
 7 *Prefunding Credit Reimbursement Program v. Veterans Elec., LLC*, WL 308545, at *4 (E.D.
 8 Wis. Jan. 29, 2021); *West v. Aetna Life Ins. Co.*, 188 F. Supp. 2d 1096, 1101 (N.D. Iowa 2002).
 9 As the Court is aware, high-quality lawyering takes time. That is why to achieve the goals of the
 10 Civil Rights Act and Section 1988, civil rights counsel should be encouraged to devote the time
 11 necessary to respond effectively to a defendant's aggressive defense in order to maximize their
 12 clients' ability to vindicate crucial civil rights. *See Quesada*, 850 F.2d at 541 n 2.

13 Tesla also makes up a new "moral hazard" theory of fee litigation, contending that a
 14 prevailing civil rights plaintiff's fees should be reduced if some of the requested time was spent
 15 after having established defendant's liability. ECF 500 8:26-9:11. Tesla's argument ignores that
 16 it *continued* to pursue or preserve its challenges to the first jury's liability finding until
 17 abandoning that challenge in its recent Ninth Circuit Mediation Questionnaire. *See supra* n. 2.
 18 Tesla also ignores that whenever fees are incurred, if they are inflated or excessive they may be
 19 challenged on that basis. *See Stonebrae, L.P. v. Toll Bros.*, 2011 WL 1334444, at *12 (N.D. Cal.
 20 Apr. 7, 2011) ("[C]ounsel seeking fee awards bear the risk that the lodestar will be subject to
 21 scrutiny and possible reduction due to unreasonable inefficiencies and duplicative efforts[.]");
 22 *see also Moreno v. City of Sacramento*, 534 F.3d 1106, 1112 (9th Cir. 2008) ("[L]awyers are not

23
 24 ⁴ Tesla asserts that work on a second trial is *per se* unreasonable and duplicative. But the cases it
 25 cites are easily distinguished on their facts. *See Krekelberg v. City of Minneapolis*, 2023 WL
 26 4828382, at *5 (D. Minn. July 27, 2023) (applying 60% reduction to preparation for "repetitive"
 27 and "inefficient" work on retrial); *Baker v. Barnard Constr. Co.*, 1999 WL 35809483, at *4
 28 (D.N.M. June 8, 1999) (reducing time where retrial had "no real contested facts" and plaintiffs
 cited same case law on appeal and remand); *Indep. Living Aids, Inc. v. Maxi-Aids, Inc.*, 25 F.
 Supp. 2d 127, 133 (E.D.N.Y. 1998) (reducing "duplicative" hours for identical second trial after
 first trial ended in mistrial); *Gries v. Zimmer, Inc.*, 795 F. Supp. 1379, 1387 (W.D.N.C. 1992)
 (reducing grossly duplicative time).

1 likely to spend unnecessary time on contingency fee cases in the hope of inflating their fees. The
 2 payoff is too uncertain, both as to the result and the amount of the fee. It would therefore be the
 3 highly atypical civil rights case where plaintiff's lawyer engages in churning.”).

4 **2. Counsel's efforts were neither duplicative nor inefficient.**

5 Mr. Diaz's opening brief, supported by his attorneys' sworn declarations and detailed
 6 time records, identified each of the tasks performed in this case and the time expended on them.
 7 ECF 494 11:10-17:16; 494-1; 494-2; 494-3, 494-4. Tesla cannot overcome the presumptive
 8 reasonableness of those well-documented efforts merely by asserting that the requested time was
 9 “too much.” Rather, it must identify specific instances of overstaffing or duplicative billing.
 10 *Moreno*, 534 F.3d at 1112-13. Tesla has not done so, instead urging the Court to apply an across-
 11 the-board 10% reduction (duplicating other reductions and ignoring counsels' billing judgment
 12 cuts and lost time records) based on purported inefficiencies.

13 Tesla's argument, at its core, is that Mr. Diaz was represented by too many attorneys over
 14 the course of this six-year case (although Tesla itself had nearly as many or possibly more).
 15 However, generalized complaints about the number of timekeepers does not establish duplication
 16 or unreasonable staffing. *See, e.g., Melendres*, 2017 WL 10808812 at *7 (Ninth Circuit Court
 17 Commissioner Order); *Edmo v. Idaho Dept. of Correction*, No. 1:17-cv-00151-BLW, 2022 WL
 18 16860011 at *6 (D. ID. Sept. 30, 2022) (court may not “reduce attorneys' fees based on an
 19 abstract notion that the number of attorneys involved seems high.”). Besides, not only did Mr.
 20 Diaz never have 19 attorneys on this case at the same time (even counting the seven who billed
 21 fewer than 50 hours, *see* ECF 494-1, Ex. 1), but the three attorneys with primary responsibility—
 22 Mr. Alexander, Mr. Organ, and Ms. Nunley—personally billed 57.4% of the total time for which
 23 Mr. Diaz seeks reimbursement. Other attorneys pitched in as necessary and to provide specific
 24 expertise as is common in complex litigation, as Tesla itself did with its three law firms,
 25 including lawyers from four different Quinn Emanuel offices.

26 Tesla broadly asserts that Mr. Diaz's counsel engaged in “substantial duplication of
 27 effort” but identifies only a *single* alleged instance of purported duplication: 12 attorneys
 28 allegedly attending the second trial. ECF 500 at 10. Tesla has the facts wrong (and, again, has

1 not revealed how many of its own attorneys billed Tesla for their in-person or remote
 2 participation at trial). Only six attorneys—Mr. Alexander, Mr. Rubin, Mr. Rosenthal, Mr. Organ,
 3 Ms. Nunley, and Mr. Collier—billed for attending the second trial in person or remotely. Four of
 4 those (Alexander, Organ, Collier, and Nunley) had speaking roles in the trial. The other two
 5 (Rubin and Rosenthal) were responsible not only for pre- and post-trial briefing and appeals, but
 6 for mid-trial motions (and some oral arguments). The remaining six did not bill for *attending* the
 7 trial, and Mr. Diaz is only requesting fees for the time they spent performing critical trial-related
 8 projects (and even then, for only 1.1 to 25.7 hours each). ECF 500-5; ECF 494-1 at 78, 120, 125;
 9 ECF 494-4 at 26, 29, 31; ECF 494-1 28:57-29:9; ECF 494-4 13:10-14:2.

10 Next, Tesla contends that Mr. Diaz routinely had partners perform tasks that could have
 11 been performed by associates. Sometimes, as the Court knows, it is far more efficient (and less
 12 costly and more effective) to have certain tasks performed by more experienced counsel. *Chaid*
 13 *v. Glickman*, No. C98-1004 WHO JCS, 1999 WL 33292940 at *15 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 17, 1999) (it
 14 was efficient and effective in Title VII action, where counsel worked for small firm, to assign
 15 routine drafting and review tasks to partners, to avoid having partner re-review documents before
 16 depositions). Again, Tesla offers only a single example: trial counsel Bernard Alexander's time
 17 preparing certain deposition summaries. As Mr. Alexander explains though, because he joined
 18 the case after those depositions had been taken, he drafted those summaries for his personal use,
 19 to prepare the examinations of the witnesses he would be questioning. Supp. Alexander Decl.
 20 ¶¶2-5. No one else could have adequately performed that critical trial-preparation task for him.

21 Tesla's superficially impressive (but substantively unhelpful) statistical analysis also cites
 22 the percentage of work performed by partners. Even if those percentages were accurate, Tesla's
 23 argument ignores that the attorneys with speaking roles at trial were almost all partners, who had
 24 to expend substantial time preparing for their appearances, which more junior attorneys could not
 25 have done for them (and which would have required more preparation time for a junior attorney).
 26 *Chaid*, 1999 WL 33292940 at *15; *see also* Mot. 13:28-14:15.

27 **3. Mr. Diaz's use of a range of "focus groups" was reasonable.**

28 Mr. Diaz conducted two focus group mock trials before the first trial—one on August 15,

1 2020 and the other in back-to-back sessions on September 5, 2021, after the trial date had been
 2 continued for one year during the Covid pandemic. Supp. Organ Decl. ¶12; ECF 500-8; *see*
 3 *Masimo Corp. v. Tyco Health Care Grp., L.P.*, 2007 WL 5279897, at *5 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 5,
 4 2007) (additional mock trial reasonable where “a substantial period of time has lapsed between
 5 exercises or the nature of the case has changed”). Later, before the second trial, Mr. Diaz
 6 conducted a series of shorter “mini” focus groups: short sessions averaging 2.5 hours each that
 7 were designed to evaluate and test the effectiveness of particular issues pertaining to the retrial.
 8 Each of those efforts were necessary and important (and Tesla’s counsel likely did the same),
 9 especially given the new focus on damages rather than liability and the shorter trial time
 10 available to each side. *See Masimo Corp.*, 2007 WL 5279897, at *5.⁵

11 **4. Counsel consolidated and underbilled most tasks that took 0.1 hours or less.**

12 Tesla also seeks a 50% reduction (again, cumulatively) for all entries of 0.1 hours, based
 13 on the unsupported and insupportable assumption that half of those 0.1 entries were for single
 14 tasks of fewer than six minutes each. Tesla is mistaken. As previously explained, Mr. Diaz’s
 15 counsel regularly combined tasks taking less than 0.1 hours into a single time entry or did not bill
 16 that time at all. ECF 494 18:5-7. Tesla has found one day in March 2023 in which Mr. Organ and
 17 Ms. Grislis billed separate one-tenth hour entries. ECF 500 12:4-15. But CCRLG, like the other
 18 firms, only bills for tasks that take one-tenth of an hour or close to it and those 0.1 entries often
 19 encompass several tasks. Supp. Organ Decl. ¶10. Plaintiff’s review of the disputed entries
 20 confirms there was no overbilling.⁶ If anything, counsels’ timekeeping practices *reduced* the
 21 overall requested fee, because very brief tasks were either not recorded or were bundled with

22
 23 ⁵ Two of the purported “focus groups” referenced by Tesla were not focus groups at all, but
 24 dry runs of Mr. Alexander’s opening statement to a group of unpaid colleagues and friends,
 25 which were certainly compensable. Supp. Organ Decl. ¶¶12-13, Supp. Alexander Decl. ¶¶ 6-7.

26 ⁶ For instance, Ms. Grislis’ 0.1 entries comprised separate calls to two witnesses, a call with
 27 Mr. Organ, an email to Mr. Diaz, several emails to Mr. Organ containing various documents and
 28 information, an email to a process server requesting he halt service, an email to request
 deposition videos, drafting a letter to a witness, sending the letter and a subpoena to the witness,
 researching a case on a California court site, researching a case on PACER, and sending the
 results of her research to Mr. Organ, for a total of 1.1 hours. ECF 494-1 at 109-10.

1 others even if they took more than six minutes combined.

2 **5. Counsel's fees for "travel" are reasonable.**

3 Tesla next seeks a 25% reduction of any time entry refers to "travel," but again, the
 4 "central inquiry is whether the time sought is reasonable." *Transbay Auto Serv., Inc. v. Chevron*
 5 *U.S.A.*, Inc., 2013 WL 843036 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 6, 2013) at *6. Because none of Mr. Diaz's trial
 6 counsel (like none of Tesla's) live in San Francisco, they had to travel, not only to trial but also
 7 to various depositions, expert witness meetings, etc.⁷ Such travel is customarily billed to monthly
 8 paying commercial clients.⁸ Tesla provides no reason why Mr. Diaz's counsel's reasonable travel
 9 time (during which they often performed substantive work, *infra* n.8.) would not be recoverable.

10 **6. Mr. Organ's attendance at the earlier Elon Musk trial was reasonable.**

11 For the damages retrial, Tesla retained attorney Alex Spiro as lead trial counsel. Mr.
 12 Spiro is a New York litigator with whom Mr. Diaz's counsel was not familiar, so they sought to
 13 obtain an understanding of Mr. Spiro's trial strategies and approaches to opening and closing
 14 statements and witness examination by attending a federal court jury trial in January 2023 in
 15 which Mr. Spiro represented Tesla's owner, Elon Musk, *In re Tesla Inc., Sec. Litig.*, 2023 WL
 16 4032010 at *1 (N.D. Cal. June 14, 2023). Mr. Diaz did not attend that trial for "weeks on end,"
 17 ECF 500 13:17-20, but only for portions of five days, choosing the segments that would best
 18 enable him to observe Mr. Spiro at successive stages of the trial process. *See* ECF 500-11. This is
 19 precisely the type of useful, limited attendance at trial that warrants an award of fees. *In re TFT-*
LCD (Flat Panel) Antitrust Litig., 2013 WL 1365900, at *10 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 3, 2013).

20 **7. There was an inadvertent clerical error in Mr. Diaz's original motion.**

21 Mr. Diaz has identified two errors in the lodestar calculations presented in his fees

22
 23
 24 ⁷ Supp. Rubin Decl. ¶3. To address Tesla's stated concern about alleged block-billing, Mr.
 25 Diaz has attached an updated chart distinguishing travel time from other substantive litigation
 26 activities. Supp. Organ Decl. ¶11 & Ex. 14.

27
 28 ⁸ Supp. Rubin Decl. ¶3. Mr. Alexander lives in Los Angeles, Ms. Nunley lives in
 Sacramento, and Mr. Rosenfeld, although he works for Altshuler Berzon in San Francisco,
 worked out of CCRLG's office in San Anselmo for the damages retrial. Supp. Organ Decl. ¶11.
 Similarly, Tesla's trial counsel traveled from Quinn Emanuel's offices in New York (Mr. Spiro),
 Texas (Mr. Griffin) and Los Angeles (Ms. Henderson and Mr. Posner).

1 motion resulting in a reduction in his lodestar request by \$67,380. First, Britt Karp’s hours
 2 should have been recorded as 32.1 rather than 39 hours—a difference of \$4,657.5. Second,
 3 although Mr. Diaz represented that Mr. Organ had eliminated 69.7 hours (among others) in the
 4 exercise of billing judgment, those time entries (valued at \$\$67,957.50) were inadvertently not
 5 deleted from Mr. Diaz’s fee request. The correct lodestar – detailed in Exhibit 11 to the Organ
 6 Declaration – should have been **\$6,553,688.50.**

7 **C. The Court Should Award a Multiplier**

8 This is the “exceptional case” in which a multiplier is warranted. To begin, Mr. Diaz is
 9 entitled to a multiplier based on his counsel’s successful prosecution of the unusually novel and
 10 complex legal and factual issues presented, including for establishing that a contract employee
 11 may enforce Section 1981 against the company that contracts for his work (but does not pay
 12 him), under a third-party beneficiary theory. While Tesla cites cases stating that a multiplier
 13 reflecting a case’s novelty and difficulty is “generally” unnecessary, ECF 500 at 17:18-18:8,
 14 courts can and do consider novelty and difficulty (like the other *Kerr* factors) to the extent those
 15 factors are not sufficiently reflected in the lodestar.⁹ Here, a multiplier is appropriate to fully
 16 compensate Mr. Diaz’s counsel for the novelty and difficulty of a range of issues upon which he
 17 prevailed (including several addressed by the extensive pre- and post-trial briefing), the
 18 significance of which is not fully captured by just counting the number of attorney hours.

19 For example, before this case, no court had applied Section 1981 third-party beneficiary
 20 standing analysis to the contract employee context. *See, e.g. Faush v. Tuesday Morning, Inc.*,
 21 808 F.3d 208, n. 13 (3d Cir. 2015) (noting Supreme Court had “not ruled out the possibility” that
 22 contract employees may have third-party beneficiary standing under Section 1981 but not
 23 addressing issue because plaintiff failed to raise it). It took civil rights plaintiffs almost 15 years
 24 after the Supreme Court first suggested the *possibility* of third-party beneficiary standing in
 25 *Domino’s Pizza, Inc. v. McDonald*, 546 U.S. 470 (2006), to achieve that result here, in a ruling

27 ⁹ *See, e.g., Edmo v. Idaho Dep’t of Correction*, 2022 WL 16860011 at *8 (D. Id. Sept. 30,
 28 2022). Tesla tries to distinguish *Edmo*, but the court expressly stated it awarded a multiplier in
 part because “counsel skillfully navigated novel legal issues.” *Id.*

1 that will enable staffing agency workers throughout the country to enforce their civil rights
 2 against workplace discrimination going forward.¹⁰

3 A multiplier (staged, for the reasons Mr. Diaz previously explained) is also appropriate
 4 because of the substantial public benefits achieved through this litigation. In addition to breaking
 5 new ground legally, the first jury's eye-popping race harassment verdict against Tesla, one of the
 6 country's highest profile companies, sent a clear signal to other companies and surely had—and
 7 is continuing to have—enormous deterrent effect. ECF 494 22:12-23:10. The Ninth Circuit has
 8 expressly recognized that the public interest is advanced by incentivizing voluntary compliance
 9 with civil rights laws. *Herrington v. Cnty. of Sonoma*, 883 F.2d 739, 744–45 (9th Cir. 1989).
 10 Contrary to Tesla's contention, the fact that Mr. Diaz recovered substantial damages does not
 11 diminish the public purposes furthered by counsels' efforts. *Id.* ("[P]ublic interests are advanced
 12 by civil rights actions even when the plaintiff is the main beneficiary of the suit and financial
 13 gain is the primary motive because a major goal of § 1988, encouraging voluntary compliance
 14 with the Constitution ... is furthered regardless of these factors.").

15 A multiplier is further justified because of the undesirability of this case and its
 16 preclusion of counsels' other work during its pendency. Tesla does not dispute that preclusion of
 17 other work can justify a multiplier and does not cite any case forbidding this Court from
 18 considering the case's undesirability. In fact, district courts routinely do so. *See, e.g., Bell v.*
 19 *Williams*, 2023 WL 4850761 (N.D. Cal. Jul. 28, 2023). There is no requirement that
 20 "undesirability" requires proof that the plaintiff was unsympathetic or shunned by the
 21 community. Rather, the factor can include consideration of the obstacles faced in the case and
 22 the riskiness of prosecuting it (especially on a purely contingent basis). *Chalmers v. City of Los*
 23 *Angeles*, 676 F. Supp. 1515, 1524 (C.D. Cal. 1987). Tesla does not address Mr. Diaz's showing
 24 that his case faced substantial obstacles from the outset that would have dissuaded many civil
 25

26 ¹⁰ Tesla's only response is that a handful of courts had previously accepted a Section 1981
 27 third-party beneficiary theory in *other contexts*. ECF 500 at 18:19-20:4 n.9. As Tesla's extensive
 28 briefing on this issue demonstrates, however, application of that theory to the staffing agency
 context was untested and uncertain. Now that Tesla has declined to appeal liability, *Diaz v.*
Tesla, No. 23-3642, Dkt. 5.1 at 2, Mr. Diaz's victory on that precedential issue is complete.

rights attorneys from proceeding, including the uncertain legal theories as applied to Tesla, the initial lack of hard evidence, and the general difficulty in obtaining emotional harm damages. Mot. at 23:21-24:17. Although Section 1988 fees and punitive damages were always potentially available, there was never any guarantee that Mr. Diaz's case would get that far, especially in light of Tesla's no-holds-barred defense, which buried Mr. Diaz' counsel with work and precluded them from pursuing or accepting other (potentially higher paying or less risky) work. See ECF 494-1 at 12 (Tesla's general counsel statement to Mr. Organ: "We will bury you. You will never see a penny. We will appeal forever.").¹¹ Tesla again tries to judge the issues based on hindsight, but Mr. Diaz's eventual success in this case does not erase how unappealing his case would have been at the outset to many plaintiffs-side employment attorneys, who would have been unwilling or unable to devote the time, effort, and skill necessary to prevail in this case.

Finally, despite Tesla's mischaracterization, Mr. Diaz does not seek a 1.6 multiplier for the entire lodestar. ECF 500 at 16:18-21. What Mr. Diaz proposed is a staged multiplier that reasonably reflects the work spent on novel issues and the impact on the public interest throughout the different stages of the litigation: a 2.0 multiplier through the first jury trial, a 1.5 multiplier through the Court's order upholding first jury trial and its liability finding; and a 1.2 multiplier for the rest of the work defending the liability ruling and obtaining compensatory and punitive on retrial.¹² Those staged multipliers are appropriate given the exceptional results obtained in this complex case that came with great potential downside risk. See ECF 494 Ex. 12.

D. Mr. Diaz's Claimed Expenses Are Reasonable and Fully Supported.

The Court should reject Tesla's proposed 50% reduction in Mr. Diaz's \$168,707.82¹³ in

¹¹ That one of Mr. Diaz's law firms later agreed to represent a putative class of Black Tesla employees does not show that individual civil rights cases like this are desirable, but that Plaintiff's counsel included the rare attorneys who would take these cases on an individual or class basis despite their obvious difficulties, because of the importance of the rights at stake.

¹² Tesla appears to have arrived at its 1.6 number by averaging the proposed multipliers of 2.0, 1.5 and 1.2, ignoring the lodestar sums to which each of those multipliers would be applied.

¹³Tesla claims Mr. Diaz seeks \$208,218.20 in expenses, but it is unclear how Tesla arrived at this number. Mr. Diaz actually seeks \$168,707.82 in expenses, though he inadvertently claimed \$187,145.24 due to a clerical error. Mot. at 25:17-18, ECF 494-1 at 295-303.

1 litigation-related expenses, which again were documented and actually spent. Like Tesla's other
 2 proposed reductions, this suggested cut is disproportionate to the few issues Tesla addresses.¹⁴

3 First, Tesla contends that the \$4,600 in expert fees paid to Dr. Smith and Mr. Robbins are
 4 not documented. That was an oversight which Mr. Diaz corrects. Supp. Organ Decl. Ex. ¶¶16-17.

5 Next, Tesla complains that Dr. Smith and expert Mr. Robbins (who was paid \$10,500)
 6 did not end up testifying at trial. At the time of their retention, though, both experts were
 7 expected to testify and both performed considerable useful work but were unable to testify for
 8 reasons beyond Mr. Diaz's control. Supp. Organ Decl. ¶¶17-18. (Smith performed a
 9 psychological examination of Mr. Diaz but his declining health prevented a trial appearance,
 10 while Robbins was unable to meet the Court's expert disclosure deadline for reasons having
 11 nothing to do with Mr. Diaz.) Those intervening circumstances should not preclude Mr. Diaz
 12 from recovering those payments, which were reasonable when incurred—and which enabled
 13 counsel to work with replacement experts more efficiently.

14 Tesla disputes some unspecified expert time entries for phone calls and document review,
 15 as being too vague to justify recovery. ECF 500 24:5-8. Tesla does not dispute that the work was
 16 performed. But even if it did, Tesla offers no justification for denying all \$109,000 of Mr. Diaz's
 17 expert witness costs, including for writing reports and appearing at trial.

18 Finally, the expenses incurred for the two mock trials and "mini" focus groups are
 19 reasonable and recoverable for the reasons stated *supra* at 9:27-10:10, as were the expenses
 20 incurred in litigating the second trial, for the reasons stated *supra* at 5:25-8:3.¹⁵ There is no
 21 justification for Tesla's attempt to chop Diaz's entirely reasonable costs in half.

22 **E. Counsel's Fees-on-Fees Hours Are Reasonable.**

23 Tesla would have this Court cap Mr. Diaz's fees-on-fees at 50 hours, despite his having
 24

25 ¹⁴ In another example of Tesla's unique approach to fee arithmetic, it first contends that the
 26 Court should reject all \$109,000 in expert expenses, ECF 500 23:20, but then seeks an overall
 27 50% reduction in expenses, apparently forgetting about the first reduction, *id.* 24:19-20.

28 ¹⁵ Those expenses included lodging, mileage, and related costs, as well as the expense
 29 incurred in printing new demonstratives necessary for the damages-only retrial. ECF 494-1
 30:17-33:10, Exs. 4, 6-11.

1 to prepare two fee applications (one after the first trial) and now this reply brief. The comparator
 2 cases cited by Tesla, ECF 500 at 24, are not comparable at all. They involved considerably
 3 shorter and less complex litigation, coupled with improper billing practices that justified
 4 substantial reductions.¹⁶ The issue is whether the requested fees-on-fees (again, for time actually
 5 spent) are reasonable for *this* case, based on *this* record, which shows that Mr. Diaz's counsel not
 6 only had to expend substantial time reviewing more than 6,000 time entries and preparing
 7 highly-detailed declarations and spreadsheets to document this fee request (which they did so
 8 successfully that Tesla's only gripe about those time records was that they measured counsels'
 9 time *too* precisely, *supra* at 10:11-11:1), but they also had to respond to numerous challenges,
 10 statistical and otherwise, based on the specific facts and circumstances of this case. Moreover, to
 11 keep the fees low, Mr. Diaz assigned most of the fee-related research and drafting work to the
 12 team's lowest-billing associate, while more senior partners with extensive fee-litigation
 13 experience helped strategize the briefing and edited the resulting drafts. ECF 494-1 25:19-26:10.
 14 Finally, despite asserting that the total amount of time for fees-on-fees is too high, Tesla does not
 15 identify a single time entry that it contends is unreasonable.

16 As previously stated, Mr. Diaz is attaching time records from October 7, 2023 to the
 17 present, documenting the additional time and expenses spent on this reply brief and related
 18 filings, which brings the total for fees-on-fees to \$258,852.50.

19 **III. CONCLUSION**

20 For the foregoing reasons, the Court should award Mr. Diaz and his counsel statutory
 21 attorney's fees of \$10,415,085, fees-on-fees of \$258,852.50, and litigation expenses of
 22 \$168,707.82.

23

24

25 ¹⁶ See *Seebach v. BMW of N. Am., LLC*, 2020 WL 4923664, at *5 (E.D. Cal. Aug. 21, 2020)
 26 (50 hours on fees too high where counsel spent only 150 hours on rest of the case);
Public.Resource.org v. Internal Revenue Serv., 2015 WL 9987018 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 20, 2015)
 27 (litigation spanned 1.5 years and was decided on summary judgment); *Medina v. City of Menlo*
Park, No. C 08-3946 WDB, 2009 WL 10710479 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 2, 2009) (counsel litigated two
 28 claims for one year before accepting Rule 68 offer); *Strategic Partners, Inc. v. FIGS, Inc.*, 2021
 WL 8917973 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 29, 2021) (excluding excessive and unnecessary time).

1
2 **CALIFORNIA CIVIL RIGHTS LAW GROUP**
3 **ALEXANDER MORRISON & FEHR LLP**
4 **ALTSCHULER BERZON LLP**
5 **THE COLLIER LAW FIRM**
6

7 Dated: December 4, 2023

8 _____
9 _____
10 _____
11 _____
12 _____
13 _____
14 _____
15 _____
16 _____
17 _____
18 _____
19 _____
20 _____
21 _____
22 _____
23 _____
24 _____
25 _____
26 _____
27 _____
28 _____
29

30 /s/ Lawrence A. Organ

31 Lawrence A. Organ
32 Cimone A. Nunley
33 J. Bernard Alexander
34 Michael Rubin
35 Dustin Collier

36 Attorneys for Plaintiff OWEN DIAZ
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100